

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 21 2004

## OFFICIAL FAX

Law Department  
7700 W. Parmer Lane  
Austin, Texas 78729

## FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DATE: June 21, 2004  
 TO: Examiner Hung V. Ngo, Group Art Unit 2831  
 COMPANY: United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 FAX NUMBER: (703) 872-9306

FROM: Michael P. Noonan  
 TELEPHONE NUMBER: (512) 996-6839  
 FAX NUMBER: (512) 996-6853

NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVERSHEET: 16MESSAGE

Enclosed is a Reply Brief in Response to the Examiner's Answer, in triplicate.  
 Serial No. 09/928,737 (Attorney Docket SC09785T CD1 Quan)

FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED/WORK PRODUCT  
 FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR GENERAL BUSINESS  
 FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR INTERNAL USE ONLY  
 FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR CONFIDENTIAL PROPRIETARY

**PLEASE DELIVER IMMEDIATELY UPON RECEIPT.**  
 ANY PROBLEMS WITH RECEIPT, PLEASE CALL: (512) 996-6849

THIS FAX AND ATTACHMENTS ARE INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH THEY ARE ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS EMAIL IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT YOU ARE STRICTLY PROHIBITED FROM READING, DISSEMINATING, DISTRIBUTING, OR COPYING THIS COMMUNICATION. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS FAX IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THANK YOU!

JUN 21 2004

OFFICIAL

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S)	Son K. Quan <i>et al.</i>	GROUP ART UNIT:	2831
APPLN. NO.:	09/928,737	EXAMINER:	Hung V. Ngo
FILED:	August 13, 2001		
TITLE:	SEMICONDUCTOR PACKAGE AND METHOD THEREFOR		

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted  
to the Patent and Trademark Office

on June 21, 2004

Patricia Parks

Patricia Parks

## REPLY BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Board of Patent Appeals & Interferences:

This Reply is filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.193 in the matter of the Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences of the rejection of the claims of the above-referenced application for patent. This Reply is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated April 20, 2004, and within the time limit for response to same, said time limit ending June 21, 2004 (June 20, 2004 being a Sunday).

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 21 2004

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S GROUPING OF CLAIMS

**OFFICIAL**

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner cites 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(7) and states: "The rejection of claims 17-21 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof." However, Appellants respectfully point out that Appellants' Brief on Appeal filed August 20, 2003 included a statement that the claims do not all stand or fall together and provided the following reasons in support thereof: "the claims of Groups B, C, D and E each recite additional limitations distinct from those in Group A and one another *and also not found in the Tuttle reference.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENTS

New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a first new point of argument. Specifically, the Examiner newly cites Lin '193 for the proposition that overmolding is a type of one-sided encapsulation, and then argues thereupon that Tuttle '513 uses one-sided encapsulation. The Examiner appears to be saying that Tuttle preempts the appealed claims to the extent the appealed claims require overmolding, regardless of whether Tuttle teaches or discloses an overmolding type of one-sided encapsulation, merely because Tuttle discloses one-sided encapsulation.

Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument

Appellants respectfully submit that the foregoing is a new grounds of rejection, and by itself constitutes sufficient basis to reopen prosecution. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree that (i) the statement that overmolding falls into a class of one-sided encapsulation, and (ii) the citation of a reference which allegedly also discloses a one-sided encapsulation, are sufficient to reject Appellants' claims which require

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

overmolding, another type of one-sided encapsulation. After all, Appellants do not purport to cover *all* one-sided encapsulation techniques, but only those in which overmolding is used as recited by claim 17. There may well be other one-sided encapsulation techniques outside the scope of the claimed invention, and Tuttle is one of those techniques. As such, the cited teachings of Tuttle do not provide sufficient basis for rejection of claims 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer**

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a second new point of argument. Specifically, in response to the Appellants' argument (as characterized by the Examiner) that the Examiner failed to show sawing through a molded encapsulation material for singulation purposes (See Examiner's Answer, pages 5-6), the Examiner argues that "cutting is *equivalent* to sawing and Tuttle discloses individual circuits can be singulated by cutting." (Examiner's Answer, page 7 (emphasis supplied).)

**Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument**

Appellants respectfully submit that cutting and sawing are not equivalent. It is possible that devices may be singulated by cutting without sawing, and by sawing without cutting. Thus, the cutting of Tuttle is insufficient to reject claim 21 under 35 USC § 102. Moreover, the mere assertion of such equivalence does not provide a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. This is especially apparent when one considers that "equivalence" is not the standard for a rejection under 35 USC § 102. The invention itself must be described. If the Office wishes to maintain that the cutting of Tuttle is the same as the sawing of claim 21, Appellants request that the Examiner provide at least some evidence of such identicity. Since neither evidence nor official notice have been provided, Appellants respectfully request that this equivalence-based rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

**New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer**

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a third new point of argument. Specifically, this new point of argument is raised in response to the Appellants' argument (as characterized by the Examiner) that "it would not be obvious to use automated equipment for the device of Tuttle because encapsulation process of these type of devices generally produces an insufficiently planar pick-up surface unless made of a particular size or using a mold or frame to define the planar surface" (Examiner's Answer, page 6). In response, the Examiner argues that because the surface of Tuttle is "substantially flat," it is therefore "obvious to use automated equipment to pick and place devices of Tuttle for simplifying assembly process." (Examiner's Answer, page 7.)

**Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument**

Appellants respectfully submit that the "substantially flat top surface" of Tuttle does not suggest, by itself, the use of automated equipment to pick and place the enclosed circuits. The Examiner's assertion does not refute Appellants' arguments offered earlier in prosecution and during this appeal. If the Office wishes to maintain that the "substantially flat top surface" of Tuttle, by itself, without evidence, makes the use of automated equipment obvious, Appellants request that the Examiner provide at least one reference of such obviousness. Since neither evidence nor official notice have been provided, Appellants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of the appealed claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reversed by the Board for the reasons stated above and in the Appellants' Appeal Brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael P. Noonan  
Attorney for Appellants  
Registration No. 42,038  
Telephone No. (512) 996-6835

**COPY**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S)	Son K. Quan <i>et al.</i>	GROUP ART UNIT:	2831
APPLN. NO.:	09/928,737	EXAMINER:	Hung V. Ngo
FILED:	August 13, 2001		
TITLE:	SEMICONDUCTOR PACKAGE AND METHOD THEREFOR		

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.6

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted  
to the Patent and Trademark Office

on June 21, 2004

Patricia Parks

Patricia Parks

**REPLY BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Board of Patent Appeals & Interferences:

This Reply is filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.193 in the matter of the Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences of the rejection of the claims of the above-referenced application for patent. This Reply is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated April 20, 2004, and within the time limit for response to same, said time limit ending June 21, 2004 (June 20, 2004 being a Sunday).

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

### REPLY TO EXAMINER'S GROUPING OF CLAIMS

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner cites 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(7) and states: "The rejection of claims 17-21 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof." However, Appellants respectfully point out that Appellants' Brief on Appeal filed August 20, 2003 included a statement that the claims do not all stand or fall together and provided the following reasons in support thereof: "the claims of Groups B, C, D and E each recite additional limitations distinct from those in Group A and one another *and also not found in the Tuttle reference.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

### REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENTS

#### New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a first new point of argument. Specifically, the Examiner newly cites Lin '193 for the proposition that overmolding is a type of one-sided encapsulation, and then argues thereupon that Tuttle '513 uses one-sided encapsulation. The Examiner appears to be saying that Tuttle preempts the appealed claims to the extent the appealed claims require overmolding, regardless of whether Tuttle teaches or discloses an overmolding type of one-sided encapsulation, merely because Tuttle discloses one-sided encapsulation.

#### Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument

Appellants respectfully submit that the foregoing is a new grounds of rejection, and by itself constitutes sufficient basis to reopen prosecution. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree that (i) the statement that overmolding falls into a class of one-sided encapsulation, and (ii) the citation of a reference which allegedly also discloses a one-sided encapsulation, are sufficient to reject Appellants' claims which require

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

overmolding, another type of one-sided encapsulation. After all, Appellants do not purport to cover *all* one-sided encapsulation techniques, but only those in which overmolding is used as recited by claim 17. There may well be other one-sided encapsulation techniques outside the scope of the claimed invention, and Tuttle is one of those techniques. As such, the cited teachings of Tuttle do not provide sufficient basis for rejection of claims 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer**

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a second new point of argument. Specifically, in response to the Appellants' argument (as characterized by the Examiner) that the Examiner failed to show sawing through a molded encapsulation material for singulation purposes (See Examiner's Answer, pages 5-6), the Examiner argues that "cutting is *equivalent* to sawing and Tuttle discloses individual circuits can be singulated by cutting." (Examiner's Answer, page 7 (emphasis supplied).)

**Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument**

Appellants respectfully submit that cutting and sawing are not equivalent. It is possible that devices may be singulated by cutting without sawing, and by sawing without cutting. Thus, the cutting of Tuttle is insufficient to reject claim 21 under 35 USC § 102. Moreover, the mere assertion of such equivalence does not provide a *prima facia* case of unpatentability. This is especially apparent when one considers that "equivalence" is not the standard for a rejection under 35 USC § 102. The invention itself must be described. If the Office wishes to maintain that the cutting of Tuttle is the same as the sawing of claim 21, Appellants request that the Examiner provide at least some evidence of such identicity. Since neither evidence nor official notice have been provided, Appellants respectfully request that this equivalence-based rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

**New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer**

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a third new point of argument. Specifically, this new point of argument is raised in response to the Appellants' argument (as characterized by the Examiner) that "it would not be obvious to use automated equipment for the device of Tuttle because encapsulation process of these type of devices generally produces an insufficiently planar pick-up surface unless made of a particular size or using a mold or frame to define the planar surface" (Examiner's Answer, page 6). In response, the Examiner argues that because the surface of Tuttle is "substantially flat," it is therefore "obvious to use automated equipment to pick and place devices of Tuttle for simplifying assembly process." (Examiner's Answer, page 7.)

**Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument**

Appellants respectfully submit that the "substantially flat top surface" of Tuttle does not suggest, by itself, the use of automated equipment to pick and place the enclosed circuits. The Examiner's assertion does not refute Appellants' arguments offered earlier in prosecution and during this appeal. If the Office wishes to maintain that the "substantially flat top surface" of Tuttle, by itself, without evidence, makes the use of automated equipment obvious, Appellants request that the Examiner provide at least one reference of such obviousness. Since neither evidence nor official notice have been provided, Appellants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

**CONCLUSION**

Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of the appealed claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reversed by the Board for the reasons stated above and in the Appellants' Appeal Brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael P. Noonan  
Attorney for Appellants  
Registration No. 42,038  
Telephone No. (512) 996-6835

Page 5 of 5

PAGE 11/16 \* RCV'D AT 6/21/2004 6:21:09 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 \* DNI:8729306 \* CSID:5129966853 \* DURATION (mm:ss):04:00

**COPY**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT(S)	Son K. Quan <i>et al.</i>	GROUP ART UNIT:	2831
APPLN. NO.:	09/928,737	EXAMINER:	Hung V. Ngo
FILED:	August 13, 2001		
TITLE:	SEMICONDUCTOR PACKAGE AND METHOD THEREFOR		

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted  
to the Patent and Trademark Office

on June 21, 2004

Patricia Parks

Patricia Parks

**REPLY BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Board of Patent Appeals & Interferences:

This Reply is filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.193 in the matter of the Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences of the rejection of the claims of the above-referenced application for patent. This Reply is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated April 20, 2004, and within the time limit for response to same, said time limit ending June 21, 2004 (June 20, 2004 being a Sunday).

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

### REPLY TO EXAMINER'S GROUPING OF CLAIMS

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner cites 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(7) and states: "The rejection of claims 17-21 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof." However, Appellants respectfully point out that Appellants' Brief on Appeal filed August 20, 2003 included a statement that the claims do not all stand or fall together and provided the following reasons in support thereof: "the claims of Groups B, C, D and E each recite additional limitations distinct from those in Group A and one another *and also not found in the Tuttle reference.*" (Emphasis supplied.)

### REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ARGUMENTS

#### New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a first new point of argument. Specifically, the Examiner newly cites Lin '193 for the proposition that overmolding is a type of one-sided encapsulation, and then argues thereupon that Tuttle '513 uses one-sided encapsulation. The Examiner appears to be saying that Tuttle preempts the appealed claims to the extent the appealed claims require overmolding, regardless of whether Tuttle teaches or discloses an overmolding type of one-sided encapsulation, merely because Tuttle discloses one-sided encapsulation.

#### Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument

Appellants respectfully submit that the foregoing is a new grounds of rejection, and by itself constitutes sufficient basis to reopen prosecution. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree that (i) the statement that overmolding falls into a class of one-sided encapsulation, and (ii) the citation of a reference which allegedly also discloses a one-sided encapsulation, are sufficient to reject Appellants' claims which require

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

overmolding, another type of one-sided encapsulation. After all, Appellants do not purport to cover *all* one-sided encapsulation techniques, but only those in which overmolding is used as recited by claim 17. There may well be other one-sided encapsulation techniques outside the scope of the claimed invention, and Tuttle is one of those techniques. As such, the cited teachings of Tuttle do not provide sufficient basis for rejection of claims 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer**

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a second new point of argument. Specifically, in response to the Appellants' argument (as characterized by the Examiner) that the Examiner failed to show sawing through a molded encapsulation material for singulation purposes (See Examiner's Answer, pages 5-6), the Examiner argues that "cutting is *equivalent* to sawing and Tuttle discloses individual circuits can be singulated by cutting." (Examiner's Answer, page 7 (emphasis supplied).)

**Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument**

Appellants respectfully submit that cutting and sawing are not equivalent. It is possible that devices may be singulated by cutting without sawing, and by sawing without cutting. Thus, the cutting of Tuttle is insufficient to reject claim 21 under 35 USC § 102. Moreover, the mere assertion of such equivalence does not provide a *prima facia* case of unpatentability. This is especially apparent when one considers that "equivalence" is not the standard for a rejection under 35 USC § 102. The invention itself must be described. If the Office wishes to maintain that the cutting of Tuttle is the same as the sawing of claim 21, Appellants request that the Examiner provide at least some evidence of such identicity. Since neither evidence nor official notice have been provided, Appellants respectfully request that this equivalence-based rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

**New Point of Argument Raised by the Examiner's Answer**

The Examiner's Answer raises at least a third new point of argument. Specifically, this new point of argument is raised in response to the Appellants' argument (as characterized by the Examiner) that "it would not be obvious to use automated equipment for the device of Tuttle because encapsulation process of these type of devices generally produces an insufficiently planar pick-up surface unless made of a particular size or using a mold or frame to define the planar surface" (Examiner's Answer, page 6). In response, the Examiner argues that because the surface of Tuttle is "substantially flat," it is therefore "obvious to use automated equipment to pick and place devices of Tuttle for simplifying assembly process." (Examiner's Answer, page 7.)

**Response to Examiner's New Point of Argument**

Appellants respectfully submit that the "substantially flat top surface" of Tuttle does not suggest, by itself, the use of automated equipment to pick and place the enclosed circuits. The Examiner's assertion does not refute Appellants' arguments offered earlier in prosecution and during this appeal. If the Office wishes to maintain that the "substantially flat top surface" of Tuttle, by itself, without evidence, makes the use of automated equipment obvious, Appellants request that the Examiner provide at least one reference of such obviousness. Since neither evidence nor official notice have been provided, Appellants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/928,737  
Reply dated June 21, 2004  
Responsive to Examiner's Answer of April 20, 2004

**CONCLUSION**

Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of the appealed claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reversed by the Board for the reasons stated above and in the Appellants' Appeal Brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael P. Noonan  
Attorney for Appellants  
Registration No. 42,038  
Telephone No. (512) 996-6835

Page 5 of 5